

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the amendments above and the remarks following is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-32 are in this case. Claims 25-29 were withdrawn by the Examiner from consideration as drawn to a non-elected invention. Claims 17 and 19 have been rejected under § 102(e). Claims 1-24 and 30-32 have been rejected under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting.

Claim 17 has now been amended to include the limitations of original claim 18. Claim 18 itself, as well as withdrawn claims 25-29, have been canceled. Terminal disclaimers are submitted herewith to overcome the double patenting rejections.

The Applicant believes that these amendments together with the terminal disclaimers resolve all issues raised by the Examiner, leaving the claims in condition for allowance.

Withdrawn Claims

In anticipation of allowance of this application, the Applicant has chosen to cancel withdrawn claims 25-29 without prejudice. The Applicant reserves the right to file these claims, or claims relating to any other subject matter described in the specification, in a divisional or continuation application.

Objections to the Specification

The Examiner has objected to the specification for various informalities. Specifically, the Examiner has indicated that the use of reference number 12 to refer to the reservoir on page 12, line 8 is apparently a typographic error.

After careful review, the Applicant believes that reference number 12 is actually the correct numeral for the reservoir, and that the inconsistency identified by

the Examiner was actually through the inadvertent swapping of numerals 12 and 14 on page 10 of the specification. Reference 12 should refer to the reservoir throughout, and reference 14 should refer to the outlet. The Applicant submits herewith an amendment to the paragraphs on page 10, lines 3-17, implementing the corrections.

The Applicant believes that the specification is now free from the informalities identified by the Examiner.

§ 102(e) Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 17 and 19 under § 102(e) as being anticipated by Holst et al. (US 6497680). The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

While continuing to traverse the Examiner's rejections, the Applicant has chosen to amend independent claim 17 without prejudice to conform to the subject matter of dependent claim 18, itself now canceled, thereby rendering moot the Examiner's rejections under § 102(e).

Non-Statutory Double Patenting Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-21 and 30-32 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-22 of U.S. Patent No. 7,291,126. The Examiner has also rejected claims 22-24 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,377,907. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

While continuing to traverse the Examiner's rejections, in order to expedite the prosecution, the Applicant submits herewith terminal disclaimers in relation to the two prior patents cited by the Examiner, together with the required fee.

The Applicant believes that the terminal disclaimers fully overcome the double patenting rejections.

In view of the above amendments, remarks and terminal disclaimers, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 16, 17, 20, 22 and 30, and hence also dependent claims 2-15, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 31 and 32, are in condition for allowance. Prompt notice of allowance is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark M. Friedman
Attorney for Applicant, Reg. No. 33,883
Dr. Mark Friedman Ltd.
Moshe Aviv Tower, 54th Floor
7 Jabotinsky St., Ramat Gan 52520, Israel
Tel: 972-3-6114100
Fax: 972-3-6114101
email: patents@friedpat.com

Date: April 8, 2011